

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 17-19, 21, 22, 25-29, 32, 34 and 35 have been amended. Claims 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 30 have been cancelled.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 25-27, 29-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Stewart (U.S. Patent No. 6, 452, 498). In response, claims 1 and 14 have been amended.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, a system for delivering location-based service to mobile clients in a building structure using short-range wireless technology, comprising:

a plurality of short range wireless access points adapted to communicate with mobile clients;

one or more location aware service proxies adapted to receive client requests for location-based services from the mobile clients and to deliver responses thereto, the responses comprising location-based information generated in view of the tracked location of the respective mobile client indicated by the location registry;

wherein at least one of the location-aware service proxy includes:

means for receiving a DNS request specifying a host name from a mobile client,

means for determining that the requested host name corresponds to a location-based service, and

means for returning an IP address of the host name based on the client's location responsive to the determination that the requested host name corresponds to a location-based service.

(Emphasis added). The claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, discloses a system that includes, among other features, at least one location aware service proxy having means for receiving a DNS request from a mobile client, means for determining that the requested host name corresponds to a location-based service, and means for returning an IP address of the host

name based on the client's location. Thus, the claimed invention advantageously determines whether the requested host name corresponds to a location-based service and returns an IP address of the host name based on the location of the client that issued a request. In one embodiment, an IP address of a requested host name that is closest to the location of the client that issued a request is returned. For example, when a user of a mobile client requests the IP address of a host named "printer", a DNS proxy determines the client's current location and returns the IP address of the nearest printer. Claim 14 recites a method for delivering location-based services to mobile clients performed by the system of claim 1. Claims 9 and 30 that previously recited these features stand rejected under Stewart, col. 6, lines 49-54. These claims have been cancelled, and their features have been incorporated to independent claims 1 and 14 respectively.

The claimed invention, as recited in claims 1 and 14 is not disclosed or suggested by Stewart. Although Stewart discloses a system for locating a mobile user and providing location aware services (col. 3, lines 35-45), Stewart does not disclose or suggest determining an IP address of the requested host name based on the client's location if the host name corresponds to a location-based service. Nor does Stewart disclose a system that performs these steps. The Examiner asserts that Stewart discloses the claimed features at col. 6, lines 49-54. The cited portion of the reference, however, fails to disclose the claimed invention. Rather, Stewart discloses various information services available to a user of a mobile client. These services may include car rental agencies, hotels, banks, airline reservation centers, taxi services, etc. (Col. 6, lines 49-54). Neither the cited paragraph nor the rest of the Stewart's disclosure teach the claimed feature of providing an IP address of a host name in response to the location of a mobile client if the host name corresponds to a location-based service. Accordingly, at least for the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 14 are patentable over Stewart.

In addition to the amendments described above, Applicants have made various other amendments to the independent and dependent claims to conform the claims to their respective base claims and/or more particularly recite the features to which the claims are directed. These amendments were not made for reasons related to patentability.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 17, 25-29, and 31-42 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 14 and derive their patentability from the independent claim from which they depend. Therefore, these claims are patentable over Stewart.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stewart. Claims 18-21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stewart and Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,493). Since claims 3, 18-24, and 28 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 14, which recite a patentable subject matter, these claims are patentable over the cited reference. Furthermore, Lee does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, as recited in claims 1 and 14.

Conclusion

Applicants respectively submit that claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, 14, 17-29, and 31-42, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully request Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Sandeep K. Singhal, et al.

Dated: March 3, 2005

By: 
Rimma Budnitskaya, Reg. No. 48, 237
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2401
Fax: (415) 281-1350